

**Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-22 are pending in the application. Claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-22 are rejected. Claim 23 is new. No new matter has been added with the addition of claim 23.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103***

Claims 2-4, 9-10, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szlam (US 6,359,892). Applicant respectfully traverses the single reference rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 since not all of the recited elements of the claims are found in Szlam. The Office action admits that Szlam does not teach the user profile located on the data network.

The Office action asserts that "one skilled in the art would recognize the advantage of locating a user profile at the data network at least in terms of time efficiency, since the user can access to his or her ISP and browse the Internet in a shorter time than someone who would have to login to the main office in order to access to the ISP and the Internet". Applicant traverses this assertion.

Applicant submits that the user profile as defined in Szlam is for remotely controlling office equipment (resources) at a main office. To control the office resources, the user would necessarily need to login to the main office network, and therefore, Applicant submits that there is no motivation to have the user profile anywhere other than within the office network.

Applicant does not appreciate that there would be a savings of time to have the user profile located on the data network when a login to the office network is nonetheless required to remotely control the office resources. Szlam does not recognize a time efficiency benefit for locating the user profile on the data network, suggesting that one does not exist for the embodiments provided in Szlam.

The Office action asserts that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time invention was made, to employ a user profile at the data network into the system

Page 7 - RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION DATED MARCH 31, 2004  
Serial No. 09/598,725

of Szlam such that enabling a user to access his or her user profile without experiencing the problem of going through layers of security firewall at a main office and other necessary measures to protect a private network when there is no need to access a file from a main office". Applicant traverses this assertion.

Applicant repeats the forgoing arguments, further providing that the user utilizes the user profile as defined in Szlam to remotely control office resources and thus, would necessarily have to go through the main office security firewall nonetheless. Applicant fails to see where Szlam teaches where the user profile is used other than to control the main office resources and therefore, where the user profile has any utility outside of remotely controlling main office resources.

Since all the elements of the claim are not found in the reference, Applicant assumes that the Examiner is taking official notice of the missing elements. Applicant respectfully objects to the taking of Official Notice with a single reference obviousness rejection and, pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2144.03, Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion of Official Notice and requests that the Examiner cite references in support of this position.

For the reasons given above, among others, Applicant submits that claim 2 is not obvious in view of Szlam. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 2.

Claim 3 depends from claim 2, and is a further limitation of claim 2, claim 3 is also not obvious in view of Szlam. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 3.

Claim 4 depends from claim 3, and is a further limitation of claim 3, claim 4 is also not obvious in view of Szlam. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 4.

Regarding claims 9 and 17, these claims were rejected based on the same rationality as claim 2 and Applicant repeats the forgoing reasons in favor of overcoming the rejection.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 9 and 17.

Whereas claim 10 depends from claim 9, and is a further limitation of claim 9, claim 10 is also not obvious in view of Szlam. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the wired telephone as shown in Szlam Figure 2A is simply a communication pass-through. The wired phone of Figure 2A, per se, is not being provided with the "user-dependent interface" as provided in Applicant's claim 10. Therefore, claim 10 is not obvious in light of Szlam. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 10.

Claims 5-6, 8, 11-12, 14-16, 18-19, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szlam in view of Beser et al. (6,496,867). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

The Office action admits that Szlam does not disclose identifying the user with a unique VOIP-name to facilitate network communication specific to the user. The Office action asserts that one skilled in the art would recognize the advantage of identifying the user with a unique VOIP-name to facilitate network communication specific to the user. The Office action provides an example illustrating the advantages of an email address that is associated with a user and not a device. Further, the Office action references Beser to show that communication can be provided by VOIP application by using e-mail addresses instead of assigned IP addresses.

Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter provided in Szlam does not lend itself to obvious association or combination with the subject matter of Beser to address the subject matter of Applicant's claim 10. Szlam teaches a system for remote access, emulation, and control of office equipment, devices and services. Applicant does not find the motivation for combining the subject matter of Szlam with identifying the user with a unique VOIP name to

facilitate network communication specific to the user. The subject matter of Szlam requires login to the main office network where identification is made in the login process or by the hardware device itself. Applicant respectfully submits that since user identification is provided by at least these two methods, there would not be an obvious association to provide a unique VOIP name as provided in Applicant's claim 10.

Claims 21 and 22 were rejected based on the same rationality as claim 20 and Applicant repeats the forgoing reasons in favor of overcoming the rejections. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 20, 21 and 22.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 20, and is a further limitation of claim 20, therefore claims 5 and 6 are not obvious in view of Szlam and Beser. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 5 and 6.

Claims 8, 11 and 12 are dependent from claim 21, and are further limitations of claim 20, therefore claims 8, 11 and 12 are not obvious in view of Szlam and Beser. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 8, 11 and 12.

Claims 14-16, 18 and 19 depend from claim 22, and are further limitation of claim 22, therefore, claims 14-16, 18 and 19 are not obvious in view of Szlam and Beser. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 14-16, 18 and 19.

In view of the foregoing reasons for distinguishing over the cited references, Applicant has not raised other possible grounds for traversing the rejections, and therefore nothing herein should be deemed as acquiescence in any rejection or waiver of arguments not expressed herein.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant submits that in view of the foregoing remarks and/or amendments, the application is in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested. The

Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, including extension fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 60-1001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 24, 2004



Paul J. Fordenbacher  
Registration No. 42,546  
P. O. Box 10105  
Portland, Oregon 97296  
Telephone: (503) 224-2713  
Facsimile: (503) 296-2172  
email: [mail@ganzlaw.com](mailto:mail@ganzlaw.com)

**Correspondence to:**

Phillips Intellectual Property & Standards  
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41  
San Jose, CA 95131 USA  
Telephone: (408) 474-9073  
Facsimile: (408) 474-9082  
USPTO Customer Number: 24738